

On-Site Wastewater Rule Development Committee

September 19, 2002

SeaTac Occupational Skills Center

18010 8th Avenue South

SeaTac, Washington

(Meeting notes)

Representation	Members / Alternates	2/13	3/28	5/22	7/17	9/19	10/24	12/12	1/23	3/13	5/8
WA Assoc of Realtors	Slough, Frederick	+	+	+	+						
	Stout, Larry		+								
Building Industry of WA	Stanton E.C.	+	+	+		+					
	Kunkel, Jenn	+		+	+	+					
On-Site Wastewater Designer	Wecke,r, Steve	+	+	+	+	+					
	Lombardi, Pete	+									
On-Site Wastewater Installer	Stuth, Jr., Bill	+	+	+	+	+					
	Stonebridge, Jerry	+									
Certified Proprietary Device Specialist	Garrison, Carl	+	+	+	+	+					
	Morris, Mike										
OSS Pumper/O&M Specialist	Tacia, Reed	+	+	+	+	+					
	Markle, Steve	+	+			+					
Proprietary Products At-Large	Patterson, Jim	+	+	+		+					
Planning WA Assoc of Counties	Shuttleworth, Mike		+	+	+	+					
Local Health Jurisdictions (Westside-Urban)	Deeter, Jerry	+	+	+	+	+					
	Starry, Art	+			+						
Local Health Jurisdictions (Westside-Rural)	Higman, Keith		+								
	Fay, Larry	+			+						
Local Health Jurisdictions (Eastside-Urban)	Perkins, Bruce		+	+							
	Dawson, Rick	+	+	+	+	+					
Local Health Jurisdictions (Eastside-Rural)	Barry, Kevin	+	+	+	+	+					
	Wolpers, John										
Soil Scientist	Cogger, Craig										
	Hermann, C			+							
Puget Sound Water Quality Action Team	Hull, Terry	+	+	+	+	+					
Indian Health Services	Dalton, Robin	+	+	+	+	+					
WA Shellfish Industry	Dewey, Bill			+	+	+					
	Taylor, Bill					+					
WA Dept of Ecology	Kimsey, Melanie		+		+	+					
	Shaleen-Hansen, Mary	+									
WA Assoc of Water & Sewer Dist	Hart, James		+	+		+					
	Wiggins, Margaret	+	+								
Consumer	Smith, Denise	+	+	+	+	+					
	Salkind, Mark	+	+	+		+					
WA Dept of Health	Soltman, Mark	+	+	+	+	+					
People for Puget Sound	Wishart, Bruce										
WA Public Utilities Districts	Kukuk, Ken										
	Robertson, Robbie										
Professional Engineer	Yuhl, Mike	+	+	+		+					
Tribal Government	McMurtrie, Doug	+	+	+	+	+					

+ Present at meeting, **Members** Alternates

RDC Meeting Agenda September 19, 2002

1. Introduction of issues surrounding Operation and Maintenance.
2. Further discussion of Alternative and Proprietary Products.
3. Product Development Permits (Experimental Systems).
4. A report from the TRC.

ON-SITE Wastewater RULE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE NOTES Meeting 5 19 September 2002

Square brackets indicate text inserted (by Eric Svaren) for clarification.

What do we need to do for this process to be a success?

1. Draft revised rule
2. Get into the meat
3. Have opportunity to address all relevant issues
4. Do what we can but explain what we couldn't do
5. Staff preparation
6. Committee members come with proposals
7. Acceptable to the public; clear, written rationale; no fatal flaws
8. Conversation is fruitful and if not—ended
9. Work to resolve the issues where we have strong points of view
10. Balanced set of rules
 - Doable
 - Protects public health
 - Understandable
 - --Industry
 - --Consumers
 - Affordable
 - Consumers protection
11. Restoring public confidence

12. Science-based – and fact – not opinion
13. Minimum standards possible
14. Highest level of public health impact – highest level of attention

Product registration (issue #1)

1. Staff update
2. Questions from RDC
 - What about alarms?
 - In design and O&M
 - On the manufacturer
 - Homeowner/operator
 - We want to know about system malfunctions
 - If component failure leads to total system failure then alarm required

Product development permit (issue #3)

1. Agree in concept to repeal experimental systems section? [Agreed]
2. Agree in concept to replace it with a product development permit process? [Agreed]
3. Is the proposed language sufficient?
 - Staff to incorporate comments and come back.

Product development

1. Permittee needs to state the purpose of the product
2. Permittee needs to protect consumer and pull out experimental system

Deemed to comply

1. “Capable of complying”
2. What standard should apply in performance testing? TS1&2?
 - What testing “regime” would need to be followed?
3. O&M is part and parcel of deeming that it complies
4. Is there any state that is going to performance testing?
5. Who pays for performance testing?
6. What happens when a homeowner stops O&M?
7. Which sites should be performance tested?
8. Performance standards → monitoring
9. Both types of permitting
 - Deemed to comply and performance testing
10. Industry not ready for performance testing
11. Performance testing is difficult
12. In sensitive areas, do performance testing if feasible
13. Testing performance would force innovation.

Deemed to comply

Includes

- Designed appropriately
- Appropriate site
- Operated properly
- Maintaining properly
- Monitoring

TRC report

1. Need to have (for megahomes) in rule or guidance standards for system capacity (e.g., 120/BR)
2. Minimum standards help cover designers – give them leverage
3. Scientific back up for standards is elusive
4. How to follow changes in use of a building—which may change flow—file design intent with title
5. TRC offers science, beyond that RDC needs to develop rationale
6. Rewarding poor designers, punishing good designers (who are accused of “Cadillacing”)
7. Flow meters

TRC report (page 2)

1. Design flow
 - Staff to research and come up with a recommendation on accommodating residence size and use
 - Look at freshwater use—in water
 - Follow use of building
2. Look at DOH issue paper 7B

O&M

1. 5 categories are OK? (Yes)
2. Table is OK in concept—let’s get to writing rules

Parking lot/O&M rules

1. Meter requirements
 - Hour meter on pump
 - Water meter
2. Manufacturer certification of O&M providers
3. Homeowners shouldn’t have to maintain/do O&M on a product that doesn’t work
 - To compensate for a product that doesn’t perform
4. Don’t want to remove O&M requirement from WAC
5. O&M based on standards at installation or at time of service (grandfathering)
6. Can LHJs manage O&M programs?